DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 687 HE 022 545

AUTHOR Wheeler, Karen J.; Tack, Martha W.
TITLE Male and Female College Presidents: Leadership Behaviors and Attitudes.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 89
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *College Administration; *College Presidents; Females; Higher Education; *Leadership; Leadership Styles; Males; Questionnaires; Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

A study on differences between the leadership behaviors and attitudes of male and female college presidents is presented. Women are rarely represented in top academic administrative positions in higher education. Reasons include sex discrimination, negative perceptions of them as administrators, and negative evaluation of their administrative performance. This study hypothesizes that there is a difference between the leadership behaviors and attitudes of male and female college presidents. A mail questionnaire, the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory, designed to identify distinguishing characteristics of effective college presidents, was used. Results are discussed according to leadership behavior scale and leadership attitude scale. It is concluded that male and female college presidents maintain similar overall leadership behaviors and attitudes, and differences in responses were based on the administrator's years of experience in higher education rather than on gender. Seven recommendations include: replicate the study using women college presidents and women chief executive officers in business and industry; study women college presidents using qualitative research procedures; and conduct other gender-related studies on the specific dimensions of presidential leadership. Three appendices are: the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory; mean responses of male and female college presidents to demographic items; and mean responses of male and female college presidents to leadership behaviors and attitudes items. Contains 33 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309687

MALE AND FEMALE COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES

Karen J. Wheeler, Ph.D.
Paul Quinn College
Waco, Texas

Martha W. Tack, Ph.D.
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

American Education Research Association
Annual Meeting
March 27-31, 1989
San Francisco, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha W. Tack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 545

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Women are rarely represented in top academic administrative positions in higher education and are practically non-existent in the office of the presidency, with only approximately 10% of all presidents being women (Green, 1988; Touchton, Shavlik, & Davis, 1984). After more than a decade of affirmative action effort, increases in the number and distribution of top women administrators in American colleges and universities have been small.

For a few highly visible women educators, there has been some improvement. In the early 1970's, no woman was president of a major coeducational university (Graham, 1979). Fifteen years later, one can identify a handful of women presidents of major institutions and chancellors of university systems. However, for the vast majority of women, the climb up the administrative ladder has not become dramatically easier despite concerted effort (Bernstein, 1984).

The sexual division of labor in the academy is apparent at a time when opportunities abound elsewhere for talented women. More importantly, it continues even when the proportion of females who have the appropriate academic background as well as experience and who are prepared to assume leadership positions is similar to that of males (Estler, 1975). Clement, DiBella, Eckstrom, and Tobias (1978) expressed grave concern over the lack of progress when they said:

> The underused and untapped talents of aspiring women administrators are needed to improve the quality of education at all levels. While equality of opportunity for women in education is an admirable goal in itself, the advantages to the educational system and to society that can

> be expected when women achieve positions of educational leadership in significant numbers are too persuasive to be ignored or delayed. (p. 50)

However, as Shavlik (1980) stated, "The slowness of the process reflects the profoundness of the change that has to take place in people's thinking to see women as capable of heading up major institutions in our society" (p. 9).

There are several interrelated reasons given for why women do not occupy chief administrative posts in most organizations. The most general reason offered is that women are discriminated against (Andruskiw & Howes, 1980). Another reason is that negative perceptions toward women as administrators make it more difficult for them to assume leadership positions (Bowman, Worthy, & Greyson, 1965; Shaffer & Wegley, 1974). Also, according to some, women are not promoted because their administrative performance is evaluated more negatively than men's administrative performance, since administration is viewed as a male occupation (Schein, 1975).

Even though the most frequently cited reason for women not attaining top positions in academe is the existence of stereotypes related to their ability to lead, a review of the literature revealed no research regarding leadership behaviors and attitudes of women college presidents as compared to their male colleagues. The void in the literature prompted this study which was designed to generate information regarding gender-related behaviors and attitudes for those who have assumed the presidency.

It is important to know how men and women lead academic institutions, to compare their similarities and differences, and to

call into question gender-related attitudes so that much needed leadership will not continue to go unrecognized. Research findings in this area should prove valuable to those who train, recruit, and select college presidents. Equally important, women need information regarding the leadership styles of those women who have become presidents. Finally, it is only after such information becomes available that women can realistically assess and analyze their successes and failures and "distinguish between challenges they face as administrators and those that result from their being female in a male system" (Touchton & Shavlik, 1978, p. 102).

Significance of the Study

The lack of women subjects in higher education leadership research has led to an inability to generalize findings. Due to the limited data base, most studies have dealt exclusively with extremely small samples of female presidents and have been limited to the reporting of demographic characteristics, personality factors, career paths, and demonstrations of competence with no mention of stylistic similarities and differences between genders (Cohen & March, 1986; McGee, 1979).

Most researchers who have examined female educational leaders based their findings upon subordinate perceptions or on the values and attitudes of upper-management males. Another shortcoming of this research area is that most studies have compared male and female managers without respect to equivalent experience and rank (Mark, 1981), perhaps indicating researchers' desire for expediency rather than thoroughness (Larwood & Powell, 1981).

Due to the limitations of previous research, it appears that alleged sex differences have been based on sex-role stereotypes rather than empirical studies focused on female presidents. According to Denmark (1977), many of the assumed differences between male and female educational leaders are not supported by data. Therefore, further research is needed to fill the existing void in both the depth and breadth of knowledge of leader behaviors and attitudes (Larwood & Powell, 1981). In order to develop a more complete picture, research into the nature of academic leadership must determine if and how women and men differ in leader behaviors and the extent to which female presidents fit the current models of leadership and strategies for success (Mark, 1981).

By comparing male and female college presidents who have the same dimensions of responsibility and hold the same rank, valuable information is now available to those interested in the presidency. Most notably, it now is possible to analyze gender-related behaviors using empirical methods as opposed to stereotypical assumptions.

Research Hypothesis and Methodology

It is hypothesized that there is a significant difference between the leadership behaviors and attitudes of male and female college presidents when controlling for years of experience in higher education administration and years in the presidency as measured by Part I of the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. In order to test the hypothesis, data were collected during the spring of 1986 in conjunction with a nationwide research project, funded by the Exxon Education Foundation, which focused on identifying the characteristics of effective college presidents (Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988).

Because data for the study of college presidents in general and data for this research on men and women presidents were collected simultaneously, information about the design of both studies will be provided.

Sample Selection

The sample selection processes for the study of effective college presidents and the research on male and female presidents will be described in the narrative that follows. The information on both studies is provided because of the interrelated nature of the research designs.

The sample for the study of effective college presidents

The list of effective college presidents was generated by asking 485 individuals knowledgeable about higher education to identify five people they considered to be the most effective college presidents in the United States. The nominators included both qualified observers and associates. In the former category, 15 were heads of national higher education associations; 28 were heads of private foundations that contributed the most money to colleges and universities during 1983; and 35 were scholars who had published works on the presidency between 1979 and 1984.

In addition, 407 associates, who were college presidents in 1984, were invited to nominate colleagues. Using the 1984 Directory of Higher Education and a table of random numbers, the college presidents were identified by stratifying all higher education institutions in the United States (excluding proprietary and professional schools) by geographical region and sector (2-year, 4-year, public, and private). At the conclusion of this selection process, it was determined that

the group of nominators was proportionately representative of every sector of higher education and each of nine geographical regions of the country.

After one follow-up mailing, 222 (46%) nomination forms were received which resulted in the identification of 412 effective college presidents. Of this group, 375 were male; and 37 were female. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

Comparison of Effective and Representative Presidents by Gender

	Effective	Representative	Total
Male	375	377	752
Female	37	35	72
Total	412	412	824

The comparative group for the study of effective college presidents included 412 presidents who were not nominated by associates or qualified observers as being effective. When identifying the group, the names of those nominated as being effective were removed from the pool of 2,800 presidents. Then, 412 "representative" presidents were selected from the remaining 2,388 presidents, using a stratified random sampling process categorized by region and type of institution.

The comparative group of presidents identified through this process was almost identical in gender composition to the nominated

presidents. As shown in Table 1, 377 members of the comparative group were males while 35 were females.

The sample for the study of women and men college presidents

In anticipation of this study, all eligible women college presidents not included in the effective college president study (N=160) were also sampled and asked to complete the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. Therefore, with the inclusion of these 160 individuals, all women college presidents whose names were included in the 1984 Directory of Higher Education (N=232), except those heading proprietary or professional institutions, were asked to participate.

Therefore, the sample for this study included women presidents (N=179) and a matched sample of male presidents (N=173) who returned questionnaires. Male and female presidents were matched on the basis of number of nominations (zero, one, two, and more than two) and type and sector of the institution they served (2-year, 4-year, public, and private). One exception to the matching principle was in the group of 2-year, private college presidents who received no nominations. The exception was necessary due to a lack of men in this category. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Number of Nominations Received by Gender for Members of the Matched Sample

Number of Nominations by Sector	Gender	
	Male	Female
Zero		
4-year Public	14	14
4-year Private	82	82
2-year Public	33	33
2-year Private	14	20
Subtotal	143	149
One		
4-year Public	9	9
4-year Private	7	7
2-year Public	2	2
2-year Private	1	1
Subtotal	19	19
Two		
4-year Public	0	0
4-year Private	5	5
2-year Public	2	2
2-year Private	0	0
Subtotal	7	7
Three or More		
4-year Public	0	0
4-year Private	4	4
2-year Public	0	0
2-year Private	0	0
Subtotal	4	4
Total	173	179

Instrumentation

The instrument used in both studies was a mailed questionnaire, the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory, developed by Fisher and Tack in 1985 to identify the distinguishing characteristics of effective college presidents. In 1984, a pilot study of the 109-item instrument was conducted using a stratified random sample of 400

college presidents (Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988). In order to assure a proportionate distribution of respondents, the population of presidents was stratified by type, sector, and geographical location. The pilot-study response rate was 64% (N=256).

Based on survey responses, comments from pilot-test participants, and statistical analyses, i.e., stepwise regression and principal components factor analysis, the 109 items were reduced to 40 statements clustered in five factors. For the purposes of this study, items in the final questionnaire were identified by a panel of judges for inclusion in one of two groups; the first group related to leadership behaviors and the second related to leadership attitudes. Following this classification of items, Chronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated to determine internal consistency reliability of the two groups of items for respondents returning the 40-item questionnaire. Reliability coefficients for the Behavior and Attitude Scales were .58 and .54, respectively. Content validity was determined by a panel of judges.

The response format for the items in Part I, from which the two groups of items were taken, was scored on a five-point Likert Scale where 1=Strongly Agree; 2=Agree; 3=Undecided; 4=Disagree; and 5=Strongly Disagree. In four instances (items 4, 8, 31, 38), the point values were reversed so that 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Undecided; 4=Agree; and 5=Strongly Agree.

Questions in Part II of the Inventory were designed to elicit professional data (degrees earned, previous experience, current position, scholarly activity, etc.). Part III information included personal demographic data such as age, sex, race, religious

preference, marital and familial data, political affiliation, birthplace and current residence, and parent's education. (See Appendix A.)

Distribution of Instrument

In the effective college president study, questionnaires were mailed to 824 presidents, with 615 (75%) questionnaires returned. After one follow-up round, the return rates for the effective and representative groups were 76% (N=312) and 74% (N=303), respectively. (See Table 3.)

Survey returns for the women college presidents who were not included in the study of the effective college presidents also are summarized in Table 3. Of these 160 women presidents, 78% (N=124) returned questionnaires, after one follow-up effort. Overall, 179 of the 232 (77%) women presidents participated in this research effort.

Analysis of Data

Data collected in the study were analyzed to test the stated hypothesis. Covariates were determined by t-tests on the selected demographic variables of current age, years in higher education administration, and years in the presidency. Statistical significance for the t-ratio was set at the .20 alpha level.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient procedure was used to determine if the dependent variables were correlated. Specifically, if leadership behaviors and attitudes were found to be correlated, then they were defined as a single dependent variable.

Table 3

Composition of Responding Population by Group

Category	Four-Year Public			Four-Year Private			Two-Year Public			Two-Year Private			Total		
	Number Involved	Number Returned	%	Number Involved	Number Returned	%	Number Involved	Number Returned	%	Number Involved	Number Returned	%	Number Involved	Number Returned	%
Effective	120	92	77	183	129	71	106	88	83	3	3	100	412	312	76
Representative	76	68	90	165	106	64	145	112	77	26	17	65	412	303	74
Women	14	11	79	86	71	83	36	26	72	24	16	67	160	124	78
Total	210	171	81	434	306	71	287	226	79	53	36	68	984	739	75

Note: Data for effective and representative presidents are from The Effective College President by J. L. Fisher, M. W. Tack, and K. J. Wheeler, 1988, New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan. Copyright 1988 by the American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company. The category labeled Women is comprised of respondents not included in either the effective or representative group.

A multivariate analysis of covariance was used to determine if significant differences existed between leadership behaviors and attitudes of male and female college presidents. In addition, univariate analysis of covariance was calculated to determine if significant differences existed on the Behavior Scale or the Attitude Scale. Statistical significance for all F-ratios was established at the .05 alpha level.

Results

Significant differences were found between males and females on two of the three demographic variables selected as probable covariates: years in higher education administration ($t=5.61$; $df=339$, $p=.00$; $\bar{X}=19.02$ and 14.41, respectively) and years in the presidency ($t=-1.45$; $df=257$; $p=.15$; $\bar{X}=9.40$ and 10.96, respectively). The current age of male and female presidents was not significantly different ($t=0.69$; $df=302$; $p=.49$; $\bar{X}=53.37$ and 52.75, respectively). Therefore, covariates for this study were defined as years in higher education administration and years in the presidency. (See Appendix B for means and standard deviations for males and females.)

Using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, it was determined that the dependent variables, leadership behaviors and attitudes, were significantly correlated ($r=.46$; $p=.00$). Thus, leadership behaviors and attitudes were defined as a single, correlated dependent variable for the purposes of the multivariate analysis of covariance.

A multivariate analysis of covariance was calculated in order to accept or reject the research hypothesis that there is a significant difference between male and female leadership behaviors and attitudes

when controlling for years of experience in higher education administration and years in the presidency. For this computation, gender was the independent variable; leadership behaviors and attitudes were the dependent variables; and years in higher education administration and years in the presidency were the covariates. As a result of using Wilks' criterion, an overall significant difference was found between male and female respondents ($F=3.38$; $df=2, 250$; $p=.04$). In addition, the multivariate analysis of covariance showed a significant difference in responses when considering the covariate years in higher education administration ($F=3.81$; $df=2, 250$; $p=.02$).

In order to determine if the differences between male and female college presidents were in leadership behaviors or leadership attitudes, a univariate analysis of covariance was calculated. In this procedure, the independent variable was gender; the dependent variable was leadership behaviors or leadership attitudes; and the covariates were years in higher education administration and years in the presidency. While no significant difference was found in leadership behaviors ($F=0.84$; $df=3, 251$; $p=.47$), a significant difference was found in leadership attitudes ($F=4.40$; $df=3, 251$; $p=.01$). However, the difference was due to years in higher education administration ($F=9.30$; $df=1$; $p=.00$), with gender not significantly contributing ($F=2.31$; $df=1$; $p=.13$). This finding was interpreted to mean that gender effects were present when leadership behaviors and attitudes were defined as a single, correlated dependent variable but not when defined as two separate dependent variables.

Due to the significant gender difference initially found on the multivariate analysis of covariance, a discriminate analysis using

residual scores to control for differences found in years in higher education administration and years in the presidency was calculated. For this computation, the Leadership Behavior Scale and Leadership Attitude Scale were maintained; and residual scores were calculated controlling for years in higher education and years in the presidency. In order to determine items that significantly discriminated along gender lines, statistical significance was set at the .05 alpha level.

The Behavior Scale contained two items that significantly discriminated between gender at the .05 alpha level, while the Attitude Scale had four items with significance established at the same level. These items represented the best linear combination that produced maximum separation based on gender. Each of the items that significantly discriminated between gender will be discussed below. For a summary of mean responses to Leadership Behavior and Attitude items, see Appendix C.

Leadership Behavior Scale

The discriminate analysis of the Behavior Scale correctly classified 65% of the male college presidents and 71% of the females. Moreover, the two items which discriminated between the gender of respondents at the .05 level of significance were: "As a college president, I try to achieve consensus" (Item 5); and "As a college president, I smile a lot" (Item 40). During the discussion of these two items, the nature of the differences between males and females is based on their mean responses as shown in Appendix C.

Building Consensus.

The discriminate analysis showed that the statement, "As a college president, I try to achieve consensus," significantly differentiated responses by gender (r^2=.04; F=9.23; p=.00). When considering the mean responses of male and female college presidents to this statement, it was found that both groups tended to agree. The mean response for males was 2.03 which was in the "agree/no opinion" range, while females' mean response was in the "strongly agree/agree" range ($\bar{X}$=1.88), indicating that female college presidents agreed to a greater extent than males that they try to achieve consensus.

It appears that when compared to men, women presidents agreed more with Wells (1980) who said, "Academic administrators need to try to cultivate the ability to lead rather than command. The house of intellect is by nature adverse to orders" (p. 119). This difference also supports the idea of a feminine leadership style by illustrating that women often prefer a "win-win" approach instead of a traditional "win-lose" approach to problem solving (Loden, 1986). In contrast, Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) found that their most effective college presidents believe less in achieving consensus ($\bar{X}$=2.40) than the presidents in this study.

Body Language.

The statement, "As a college president, I smile a lot," was a predictor along gender lines (r^2=.02; F=5.30; p=.02). Although both male and female presidents tended to agree ($\bar{X}$=2.20 and 1.95, respectively), women agreed to a greater extent than men.

Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) stated that a "joke or a smile eases tension and stills troubled waters, thus facilitating group

interaction without creating overt hostility" (p. 37). Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) also found that their most effective presidents reported smiling more frequently ($\bar{X}$=2.27) than did the females in this study.

Leadership Attitude Scale

The discriminate analysis of the Attitude Scale correctly classified 66% of the men and 70% of the women, for an average rate of 68%. Moreover, the following four items of the Attitude Scale predicted the respondents' gender at the .05 level of significance: "am primarily concerned about being liked" (Item 4); "believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident" (Item 7); "believe in merit pay" (Item 10); and "count committee meetings as mistakes" (Item 21). The nature of the gender differences reported below are based on the mean responses of each group as identified in Appendix C.

Concern about Being Liked.

The discriminate analysis showed that this item significantly differentiated responses of male and female college presidents (r^2=.05; F=11.96; p=.00). Because this item was reverse-scored, the mean responses of the two groups indicated that women ($\bar{X}$=1.87) disagreed more than men ($\bar{X}$=2.15) that they are concerned about being liked.

As can be seen by the mean responses, which are similar to those reported in the Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) study, both male and female presidents generally are not concerned with being liked. Yet, in contrast to the findings of Jones (1985) and Donnell and Hall (1980) who reported no gender-related differences in the need for good interpersonal relationships, the results of this study indicated that

women actually have less concern for being liked than men. In addition, these findings refuted the general perception that women "place greater emphasis on happy interpersonal relationships" than men (Baird & Bradley, 1979, p. 105).

Self Confidence.

The statistical analysis showed that one can predict the gender of presidents based on their responses to the statement, "As a college president, I believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident" (r^2=.02; F=4.05; p=.05). Mean responses indicated that women ($\bar{X}$=1.40) agreed more than men ($\bar{X}$=1.48) that the leader should be perceived as self-confident.

Bass (1981) stated that effective leaders "engage in impression management to bolster their image of confidence, increasing subordinate compliance and faith in them" (p. 40). Similarly, other researchers have ranked self-assurance and perceived success as two of the most desired leadership traits (Ghiselli, 1963; Harrell, 1969; Hesburgh, 1979; Hornaday & Bunker, 1970).

When considering gender differences, many researchers have reported that men have more self-confidence than women (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). However, the results of this study indicated that women agree more than men that self-confidence is an essential element in effective leadership.

Merit Pay.

Discriminate analysis showed that the response pattern in support of merit pay was significantly different for men and women (r^2=.06; F=17.56; p=.00). Specifically, male presidents reported that they

"believe in merit pay" ($\bar{X}$=1.79) to a greater extent than women ($\bar{X}$=2.23).

Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) found that the most effective presidents support merit pay more strongly than their representative colleagues. However, they went on to say that "people are not primarily motivated to work harder or to achieve greatness because of monetary rewards. Rather, they thrive on such things as recognition, the potential for advancement, and the job itself" (p. 70). It appears that the male college presidents in this study emphasized monetary rewards more than their female counterparts.

Committee Meetings.

The gender of college presidents was also predicted by discriminate analysis based on their responses to the statement, "As a college president, I count committee meetings as mistakes" (r^2=.05; F=13.28; p=.00). Mean responses showed that women ($\bar{X}$=4.08) disagreed with this statement more than men ($\bar{X}$=3.76).

These results confirmed the findings of other researchers. According to Miller (1983), good leaders are sensitive to the ways in which decisions affect various factions of the university community. They realize that unless individuals on campus participate in the decision-making process, the decisions will not be fully accepted (Brown & Walworth, 1985; Burke, 1977). In keeping with the notion of building consensus and involvement, gender-related differences also were found by Wexley and Hunt (1974) who noted that women ask for suggestions (i.e., possible ways of action, direction) more often than men.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicated that male and female college presidents maintain similar overall leadership behaviors and attitudes. Differences in responses when considering behaviors and attitudes as separate variables were based on years of experience in higher education administration rather than gender.

When adjusting for years in the presidency and years in higher education administration, males and females differed in two specific leadership behaviors and four leadership attitudes. With regard to behaviors, female college presidents agreed to a greater extent than male presidents that they try to achieve consensus; they also agreed to a greater extent than male presidents that they smile a lot.

In terms of leadership attitudes, female presidents disagreed more than male presidents that they are concerned about being liked, and they noted that leaders should be perceived as self-confident to a greater extent than did the men. Moreover, male presidents believed in the concept of merit pay to a greater extent than female presidents and disagreed less than women that they count committee meetings as mistakes.

Based on the results of this study, the information available in the literature, and the authors' appraisal, several inferences can be drawn. First, when considering the leadership behaviors and attitudes of college presidents, women try harder to achieve consensus, value committee meetings to a greater extent, are more concerned with perceived self-confidence and less with being liked, believe less strongly in merit pay, and smile more than their male counterparts. Possibly, women understand that in order to survive in the office they

must at least attempt to get various constituencies to reach agreement. Moreover, they may feel that the only way consensus can be achieved is through the active participation and involvement of constituent groups. Furthermore, it is likely that they realize some people will not like them simply because they are women and that their effectiveness depends in part on the perception of others. Therefore, perhaps they do not worry about those who do not like them; but they believe strongly that they must be perceived as self-confident.

Finally, perhaps women are less supportive of merit pay because they have seen the problems associated with the implementation of the concept. It could be that they have experienced on a first-hand basis the biases and cronyism that exist in "objective" evaluation systems and also understand from personal experience that it is difficult to quantify quality.

Recommendations

More research is necessary regarding differences in the leadership styles of male and female college presidents. In particular, there is a need to know more about women presidents in order to support those now holding the office, to modify discussions and training in leadership programs, and to encourage respect for the gender-related differences that exist. In conjunction with the findings of this study, the following recommended research will help increase understanding and focus on the importance of diversity in the presidency.

1. Because motives may influence behaviors and attitudes, other gender-related studies should be conducted on the specific dimensions of presidential leadership including the need for

power, affiliation, and achievement. Moreover, it will be important that future researchers avoid drawing conclusions regarding the origins and expressions of motives from the observation of men solely.

2. In this study, years of experience in higher education administration affected the leadership behaviors and attitudes of men and women college presidents. Given this finding, further research should be conducted on other aspects of leadership and management, such as conflict management, communication skills, human relations skills, and autocratic versus participatory leadership styles. It will also be important to investigate if gender interacts with years of experience and causes different behavioral patterns for men and women presidents.
3. This study should be replicated using women college presidents and women chief executive officers in business and industry. The information obtained could be used to compare their demographic profiles and to determine if different behaviors and attitudes exist between female academic and private-sector executives.
4. Research should be conducted using a sample of women college presidents, women at lower levels of academic administration who aspire to the presidency, and women academic administrators who do not seek the presidency. The findings then could be compared to determine if any similarities or differences in leadership behaviors and attitudes exist among these groups.

5. Women college presidents should be studied using qualitative research procedures. In-depth interviews of women presidents and their subordinates should be conducted in order to present a more complete picture of their presidential leadership styles.
6. In future research it will be important to establish a control factor for women presidents who belong to Roman Catholic religious orders, a procedure that was not included in this study because of small cell sizes. Due to the presidential selection process of Catholic institutions headed by nuns and the presidents' frequent deviation from typical career paths, it is possible that different results could occur within this population of women college presidents.
7. A similar study should be conducted to determine gender-related differences in leadership behaviors and attitudes at other levels of academic administration, i.e., department chair, dean, vice president. Perhaps differences are more pronounced at these lower levels in the hierarchy.

Clearly, more research on male and female college presidents should be conducted. Regardless, the results of this study shed some light on gender-related behavioral and attitudinal differences and represent one step in the direction of increased understanding of diversity in leadership at the chief executive officer's level in academe.

References

Andruskiw, O., & Howes, N. J. (1980). Dispelling a myth that stereotypic attitudes influence evaluations of women as administrators in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 51, 475-496.

Baird, J. E., & Bradley, P. H. (1979). Styles of management and communication: A comparative study of men and women. Communication Monographs, 46, 101-111.

Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership research. New York: Free Press.

Bernstein, A. R. (1984). Foundation support for administrative advancement: A mixed record. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in higher education. New directions for higher education, No. 45 (pp. 77-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowman, G. W., Worthy, N. B., & Greyson, S. A. (1965). Problems in review: Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 43, 14-28, 164-178.

Brown, M., & Walworth, W. (1985). Educational leadership: College presidents in the decade ahead. College Board Review, No. 138, 22-23, 34.

Burke, J. C. (1977). Coping with the role of college or university president. Educational Record, 58, 388-402.

Clement, J. P., DiBella, C. M., Eckstrom, R. B., & Tobias, S. (1978). Taking sexism out of education: The national project on women in education. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Denmark, F. L. (1977). Styles of leadership. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 2, 99-113.

Donnell, S. M., & Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A case of no significant difference. Organizational Dynamics, 8, 60-70.

Estler, S. (1975). Women as leaders in public education. Signs, 1, 363-368.

Fisher, J. L., Tack, M. W., & Wheeler, K. J. (1988). The effective college president. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Ghiselli, E. E. (1963). The validity of management traits in relation to occupational level. Personnel Psychology, 16, 109-113.

Graham, P. A. (1979). Women in academe. Science, 169, 1284-1290.

Green, M. F. (1988). The American college president. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Harrell, T. W. (1969). The personality of high earning MBA's in big business. Personnel Psychology, 22, 457-463.

Hesburgh, T. (1979). The college presidency: Life between a rock and a hard place. Change, 11, 43-47.

Hornaday, J. A., & Bunker, C. S. (1970). The nature of the entrepreneur. Personnel Psychology, 23, 47-54.

Jones, S. W. (1985). Determining the impact of biographical and situational variables on the leadership styles and effectiveness of community/junior college administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 251).

Larwood, L., & Powell, G. N. (1981). Isn't it time we were moving on? Necessary future research on women in management. Group and Organizational Studies, 6, 65-72.

Loden, M. (1986). Feminine leadership. It can make your business more profitable. Vital Speeches of the Day, 52, 472-475.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Mark, S. F. (1981). Leadership in higher education: A critical review of sex differences. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 1, 180-200.

McGee, M. (1979). Women college and university presidents: Their personal and professional characteristics, career development patterns, and opinions about their roles. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 08A. (University Microfilms No. 80-02, 878)

Miller, E. L. (1983). University leaders: Having style rather than simply a style. Change, 15, 10-11.

Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 340-344.

Shaffer, D. R., & Wegley, C. (1974). Success orientation and sex-role congruence as determinants of the attractiveness of competent women. Journal of Personality, 42, 586-600.

Shavlik, A. (1980, June). S-L-O-W but steady. Comment, 9.

Touchton, J., & Shavlik, D. (1978). Challenging the assumption of leadership: Women and men of the academy. In C. F. Fisher (Ed.), Developing and evaluating administrative leadership. New directions for higher education, No. 22 (pp. 95-106). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Touchton, J., Shavlik, D., & Davis, F. (1984). Women CEOs in higher education. Getting to the top. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Wells, H. B. (1980). Being lucky: Reminiscences and reflections. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Wexley, K. N., & Hunt, P. J. (1974). Male and female leaders: Comparison of performance and behavior patterns. Psychological Reports, 35, 867-872.

PC:TACK4

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to identify the characteristics of an effective college president (chancellor) and focuses on the following three areas: styles/attitudes, professional information, and personal data. Please provide the information in the format requested.

Part I: Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style

Please react to the following statements about your own characteristics as a leader by checking the appropriate responses. Your responses should represent your perceptions of yourself as a leader.

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree UD = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

As a college president, I:

	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Try to achieve consensus	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Believe in organizational structure.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Believe in close collegial relationships	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Believe that a leader serves the people.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Believe in merit pay	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
17. Choose another CEO as a confidant.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

		SA	A	UD	D	SD
18.	Believe in community involvement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
19.	Always appear energetic	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
20.	Am often viewed as a loner	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
21.	Count committee meetings as mistakes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
22.	Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
23.	Accept losses gracefully	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
24.	Tend to work long hours	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
25.	Often like people who are different	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
26.	Only occasionally speak spontaneously	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
27.	Am warm and affable	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
28.	Would rather be influential than professionally admired	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
29.	Dress well	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
30.	Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
31.	Believe in the institution at all costs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
32.	Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
33.	Appear to make decisions easily	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
34.	Appear confident even when in doubt	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
35.	View myself and the institution as one	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
36.	Am often seen as somewhat aloof	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
37.	Enjoy stirring things up	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
38.	Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
39.	Appear to enjoy the perquisites of office	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
40.	Smile a lot	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Part II: Professional Data

Degrees Earned:

Doctorate: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

PhD. . . [ ] DFA. . . [ ] JD. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

EdD. . . [ ] DBA. . . [ ] MD. . . [ ] _____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . . . [ ]

Private . . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Master's: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

MA. . . [ ] MBA. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

MEd . . [ ] MFA. . . [ ] _____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . . . [ ]

Private . . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Baccalaureate: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

BS. . . [ ] BFA. . . [ ]

BA. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

_____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public . . . . . [ ]

Private. . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Previous Experience:

Positions Held in Higher Education (Beginning with the first position, indicate the offices you have held using the codes listed below. When designating associate or assistant positions, codes should be combined, e.g., JE = assistant dean. If you changed institutions but kept the same title, please make separate entries for each position occupied. Additionally, please refer to the institutional codes when identifying the type of institution at which you were employed.)

Position Codes

A - Full-time Faculty Member
B - Department Chairperson
C - Coordinator
D - Director
E - Dean
F - Assistant-to-the
G - Vice President
H - President
I - Associate
J - Assistant
K - Other

Institutional Codes

1 - 4-year, Public
2 - 4-year, Private
3 - 2-year, Public
4 - 2-year, Private

Position Chronology	Position Code	Area	Years in Position	Type of Institution
1	_____	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____	_____
4	_____	_____	_____	_____
5	_____	_____	_____	_____
6	_____	_____	_____	_____
7	_____	_____	_____	_____
8	_____	_____	_____	_____
9	_____	_____	_____	_____
10	_____	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____	_____

Total Years in Higher Education Administration: _____

Total Years of Experience Outside Higher Education: _____

Total Years in Presidential Position: _____

Age Upon Assumption of First Presidency: _____

Current Position:

Years in Current Presidency: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . [ ] Two-Year. . . [ ]

Private . . [ ] Four-Year . . [ ]

Student Population (Headcount) of Campus: _____

Salary: _____

Scholarly Activity

Number of Books Published: _____

Approximate Number of Articles in Refereed Journals: _____

Approximate Number of Professional Organization Memberships: _____

Two Professional Organizations in Which You Participate Frequently:

Organization #1: _____

Office(s) Held: _____

Organization #2: _____

Office(s) Held: _____

Part III: Personal Information

Age: _____

Sex: Male. . . [ ]
Female. . [ ]

Race: American Indian . . . [ ]
Asian Indian . . . . [ ]
Black . . . . . [ ]
Caucasian . . . . . [ ]
Chinese . . . . . [ ]
Filipino. . . . . [ ]
Japanese. . . . . [ ]
Spanish/Hispanic. . . [ ]
Other (specify) . . . [ ]

_____

Religious Preference:
Eastern Orthodox. . [ ]
Jewish. . . . . [ ]
Muslim. . . . . [ ]
Roman Catholic. . . [ ]
Protestant. . . . [ ]
Baptist. . . [ ]
Episcopal. . [ ]
Methodist. . [ ]
Presbyterian [ ]
Other (specify) . [ ]

_____

Marital Status:
Never Married . . . [ ]
Divorced. . . . . [ ]
Widowed . . . . . [ ]
Now Married . . . . [ ]

Number of Marriages:
0 . . . . [ ]
1 . . . . [ ]
2 . . . . [ ]
3 . . . . [ ]
4 . . . . [ ]

Spouse's Occupation: (check one)

Professional (e.g., accountant, engineer, lawyer, doctor, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Manager, Business Official (e.g., finance manager, sales administrator, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Proprietor or Business Owner (e.g., contractor, gasoline dealership, etc.) . . . . . [ ]

Sales and Clerical (e.g., billing clerk, mail carrier, insurance sales, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Technician/Semi-Professional (e.g., draftsperson, surveyor, health therapy, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Craftsman or Foreman (e.g., carpenter, jeweler, mechanic, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Skilled Machine Operator (e.g., drill press, lathe, truck driver, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Service Worker (e.g., police officer, hospital orderly, barber, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Laborer (e.g., construction, factory, gas station, etc.) . . . . . [ ]

Farmer . . . . . [ ]

Other (specify) . . . . . [ ]

_____

Number of Children: 0 . . . [ ] Ages of Children: ____
1 . . . [ ] ____
2 . . . [ ] ____
3 . . . [ ] ____
4 . . . [ ] ____
5+. . . [ ] ____

State or Foreign Country of Birth: _____ Political Affiliation: American Independent. . . [ ]
State of Current Residence: _____ Democrat. . . . . [ ]
Republican. . . . . [ ]
Other (specify) . . . . . [ ]
_____

Father's Education: Less Than High School. . . [ ] Post-Baccalaureate Courses. . . [ ]
Some High School . . . . . [ ] Master's Degree . . . . . [ ]
High School Diploma. . . . [ ] Doctoral Degree . . . . . [ ]
College Courses. . . . . [ ] Post-Doctoral Work. . . . . [ ]
Baccalaureate Degree . . . [ ]

Mother's Education: Less Than High School. . . [ ] Post-Baccalaureate Courses. . . [ ]
Some High School . . . . . [ ] Master's Degree . . . . . [ ]
High School Diploma. . . . [ ] Doctoral Degree . . . . . [ ]
College Courses. . . . . [ ] Post-Doctoral Work. . . . . [ ]
Baccalaureate Degree . . . [ ]

Number of Siblings: Younger Brothers _____ Older Brothers _____
Younger Sisters _____ Older Sisters _____

Please return this instrument by December 15, 1985, to:

Bowling Green State University
ATTN: Dr. Martha W. Tack, EDAS
Bowling Green, OH 43403

24/2

© 1985 James L. Fisher and Martha W. Tack

Note: From The Effective College President by J. L. Fisher, M. W. Tack, and K. J. Wheeler, 1988. New York: American Council on Education/MacMillan. Copyright 1988 by the American Council on Education and MacMillan Publishing.

APPENDIX B

Mean Responses of Male and Female College Presidents to Demographic Items*

Item	Male N	Male X	Male SD	Female N	Female X	Female SD	df	t	p+
Years in Beginning Position	150	4.74	4.40	156	5.27	4.47	304	-1.04	.30
Years in Last Position Prior to Presidency	149	4.24	2.73	148	4.35	4.00	259	-0.28	.78
Age of Assumption of the Presidency	167	43.46	6.41	173	45.70	7.38	338	-2.99	.00
Years in Higher Educational Administration	168	19.02	7.68	173	14.41	7.49	339	5.61	.00
Years Outside Higher Education	169	9.70	6.52	171	6.90	5.53	328	4.27	.00
Years in Current Presidency	168	8.46	6.38	171	6.61	5.63	337	2.82	.01
Years in Presidential Position	122	9.40	8.27	137	10.96	8.96	257	-1.45	.15
Headcount	171	3908	5727.22	172	4187	11171.90	255	-0.29	.77
Salary	151	$67,180	19814.92	154	$60,270	16452.97	291	3.31	.00
Published Articles	147	10.32	17.92	138	5.70	9.99	232	2.71	.01
Published Books	130	1.65	8.49	124	0.77	1.40	136	1.16	.25
Number of Professional Organizations	153	5.81	4.35	155	6.63	3.29	283	-1.87	.06
Current Age	154	53.37	7.40	150	52.75	8.36	302	0.69	.49
Number of Children	170	2.68	1.25	132	1.14	1.45	258	9.55	.00
Number of Marriages	167	1.07	0.45	123	0.83	0.82	177	2.90	.00

*T-tests are reported for items when mean responses could be calculated.

+Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

APPENDIX C

Mean Responses of Male and Female College Presidents to Leadership Behaviors and Attitudes Items

Scale Items	Male (N=173) $\bar{X}$	Male SD	Female (N=179) $\bar{X}$	Female SD
Leadership Behaviors:				
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed.	2.14	0.94	2.37	1.01
5. Try to achieve consensus.	2.03	0.65	1.88	0.61
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive.	1.77	0.68	1.77	0.68
12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo.	2.77	1.04	2.75	1.06
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.	1.62	0.57	1.54	0.50
15. Maintain a measure of mystique.	2.76	1.11	2.84	1.06
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution.	2.07	0.90	2.20	0.99
17. Choose another CEO as a confidant.	2.78	1.08	2.75	1.09
19. Always appear energetic.	1.95	0.80	1.77	0.74
20. Am often viewed as a loner.	3.02	1.11	3.11	1.14
23. Accept losses gracefully.	2.48	0.98	2.21	0.73
24. Tend to work long hours.	1.80	0.75	1.64	0.76
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously.	3.61	1.07	3.71	1.07
27. Am warm and affable.	2.17	0.73	2.09	0.78
29. Dress well.	1.92	0.54	1.91	0.61

Scale Items	Male (N=173) $\bar{X}$	Male (N=173) SD	Female (N=179) $\bar{X}$	Female (N=179) SD
Leadership Behaviors (continued)				
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement.	1.91	0.60	1.95	0.64
33. Appear to make decisions easily.	2.17	0.79	2.14	0.78
34. Appear confident even when in doubt.	2.32	0.84	2.12	0.71
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof.	3.12	1.03	3.21	1.08
37. Enjoy stirring things up.	3.21	1.18	3.22	1.12
*38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant.	3.53	0.98	3.55	0.96
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office.	2.72	0.92	2.63	0.89
40. Smile a lot.	2.20	0.94	1.95	0.84
Leadership Attitudes:				
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential.	1.25	0.45	1.34	0.54
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks.	1.34	0.49	1.29	0.45
*4. Am primarily concerned about being liked.	2.15	0.79	1.87	0.60
6. Believe in organizational structure.	1.77	0.58	1.78	0.57
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident.	1.48	0.59	1.40	0.49
*8. Believe in close collegial relationships.	3.87	0.89	3.95	0.84

Scale Items	Male (N=173) $\bar{X}$	Male (N=173) SD	Female (N=179) $\bar{X}$	Female (N=179) SD
Leadership Attitudes (continued)				
9. Believe that a leader serves the people.	1.56	0.64	1.56	0.67
10. Believe in merit pay.	1.79	0.83	2.23	0.92
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.	1.59	0.54	1.59	0.60
18. Believe in community involvement.	1.50	0.56	1.42	0.50
21. Count committee meetings as mistakes.	3.76	0.86	4.08	0.60
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague.	2.17	0.91	2.27	0.90
25. Often like people who are different.	2.10	0.68	2.03	0.79
28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired.	2.93	1.08	2.97	1.05
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual.	1.61	0.58	1.55	0.61
*31. Believe in the institution at all costs.	3.33	1.19	3.26	1.08
35. View myself and the institution as one.	2.93	1.21	3.17	1.17

*Reverse-scored items